### Meta-Theory

Interpretation: spec interps about the aff advocacy must be either a) disclosed on the NDCA LD wiki at least 10 minutes before the round, b) checked in CX, or c) checked immediately before the round begins.

Violation: they did none of those things.

Standards:

1. Substantive education. Making sure I know the interp is a possibility ensures I can include a country specifically in the 1AC so you don’t have to read T against me. Unnecessary theory is bad for education since it crowds out substantive debate and doesn’t apply to the real world since we can’t read theory when we’re older but we do need to make ethical decisions and know about current events. This also acts as a counter interp to their shell because it proves I would have specced if you had just made sure I knew you might be reading it.

2. Stratskew. The aff is always subject to must spec, can’t spec and bidirectional interps. This means the neg always has a shell they can read against the aff and prep a ton of frontlines so they get an easy out every single round. Kills fairness because you’ll have the structural theory advantage against me. My interp solves since I can accept your interp and avoid you having to read spec against me.

D. Cross apply their voter-meta theory comes first. A. it’s a prerequisite to evaluating your shells since I indict your ability to read them in the first place B. theoretical abuse is worse than substantive abuse because theory is on a higher layer and determines the ballot decisively whereas one can deal with losing arguments on substance by going for other arguments.

### C/I

#### Counter interp: debaters don’t need to specify a decommissioning mechanism.

#### 1. Extra-topicality bad. Decommissioning is decided on a case-by-case basis by the owners.

NEI 16 “Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants” Nuclear Energy Institute August 2016 <http://www.nei.org/master-document-folder/backgrounders/fact-sheets/decommissioning-nuclear-energy-facilities> JW

Decommissioning is the process by which nuclear power plants are retired from service and terminate the operating licenses granted by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. To ensure that decommissioning is safe and environmentally sound, the NRC established regulations and associated guidance outlining the requirements and process companies must follow. The NRC’s decommissioning process facilitates participation by state and local authorities at several points along the way. The process involves decontaminating the facility to reduce residual radioactivity, dismantling the structures, removing contaminated materials to appropriate disposal facilities, storing used nuclear fuel until it can be removed from the site for disposal or consolidated storage, and releasing the property for other uses. The owner remains accountable to the NRC until decommissioning has been completed and the agency has terminated its license. To prepare for eventual decommissioning of a nuclear power plant, the NRC requires the companies that operate them to provide assurance that funds will be available to decommission the facility. Generally, this funding assurance is provided through a trust fund that is projected to grow throughout the plant’s operating lifetime. Companies work with federal and state regulators to ensure that enough money will be available. Decommissioning trust funds are not under the direct administrative control of the generating companies, and use of the funds is limited to legitimate decommissioning expenses. Ten reactors have completed decommissioning safely to either the point of license termination or the point where the remaining activities are limited to management of an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI). Currently, 18 commercial power reactors are in decommissioning, and several more will transition to this process over the next few years.

#### Companies choose, not governments.

NRC 15 United States Nuclear Regulatory Committee “Backgrounder on Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants” May 2015 http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/decommissioning.html JW

Licensees may choose from three decommissioning strategies: DECON, SAFSTOR, or ENTOMB.

#### Kills fairness and education – if I defend things in the aff external to the resolution, there’s an infinite neg prep burden because there’s nothing stopping me from defending any other advocacy, makes it impossible for you to engage because you won’t have research and I’ll choose hyper-quality advocacies.

#### 2. Spec’s infinitely regressive – there are thousands of things I could specify in my advocacy about the particulars of the aff policy. But, if I spec each one of them then the entire AC will just be a plan text with no actual offense.

#### 3. Topic literature – even if there are technically three ways to decommission, NONE of the articles in the topic lit talk about the different effects of each one. Lack of lit proves it’s not crucial to debating the aff advocacy, your interp forces us to arbitrarily narrow the debate down which excludes two thirds of topic debating.

### AT: Shift

#### 1. I can’t shift- judges don’t let debaters just make up parts of their advocacy.

#### 2. 2nr theory solves and is more persuasive

### AT: Can’t have a debate

#### Empirically denied